

claims.

## XI. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the video editing system of the present invention, as recited in the present claims: defining, responsive to at least one preestablished content category, a plurality of segments in a video, associating, responsive to the at least one preestablished content category, a descriptor with at least one of the plurality of segments, and producing a segment map that provides for a variable arrangement of the plurality of segments, is patentably distinguished from the applied references.

Applicant respectfully submits that Westland alone or in combination with the other applied references does not anticipate, and does not render obvious, the present invention as presently claimed. Therefore, the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Westland, or under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Westland in view of Kawai and/or Vogel, is unwarranted and should be reversed.

Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Max Abecassis  
Applicant  
305-932-1257